EXHIBIT A

Case 1:18-cv-05025-JMF Document 113-1 Filed 08/30/18 Page 2 of 12 I739stao

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	x	
3	STATE OF NEW YORK, et al.,	
4	Plaintiffs,	
5	v.	18 Civ. 2921 (JMF)
6		10 CIV. 2521 (OFF)
7	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, et al.,	
8		Argument
9	Defendants.	
10	x	
11	NEW YORK IMMIGRATION	
12	COALITION, et al.,	
13	Plaintiffs,	
	v.	18 Civ. 5025 (JMF)
14 15	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, et al.,	
16		Argument
17	Defendants.	
18	x	
19		
20		New York, N.Y. July 3, 2018
21	Before:	9:30 a.m.
22	HON. JESSE M.	FURMAN,
23		District Judge
24		
25		

I739stao

1	APPEARANCES
2	NEW YORK STATE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
3	Attorneys for Plaintiffs BY: MATTHEW COLANGELO AJAY P. SAINI
4	- and - ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER
5	BY: JOHN A. FREEDMAN - and -
6	LAW OFFICE OF ROLANDO L. RIOS BY: ROLANDO L. RIOS
7	- and - DEPARTMENT OF LABOR BY: ELENA S. GOLDSTEIN
9	United States Department of Justice
10	Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch Attorneys for Defendants BY: BRETT SHUMATE
11	KATE BAILEY JEANNETTE VARGAS
12	STEPHEN EHRLICH
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

full scope of such materials. Accordingly, plaintiffs' request for an order directing defendants to complete the Administrative Record is well founded.

Finally, I agree with the plaintiffs that there is a solid basis to permit discovery of extra-record evidence in this case. To the extent relevant here, a court may allow discovery beyond the record where "there has been a strong showing in support of a claim of bad faith or improper behavior on the part of agency decision-makers." National Audubon Society v. Hoffman, 132 F.3d 7, 14 (2d Cir. 1997). Without intimating any view on the ultimate issues in this case, I conclude that plaintiffs have made such a showing here for several reasons.

First, Secretary Ross's supplemental memorandum of
June 21, which I've already discussed, could be read to suggest
that the Secretary had already decided to add the citizenship
question before he reached out to the Justice Department; that
is, that the decision preceded the stated rationale. See, for
example, Tummino v. von Eschenbach, 427 F.Supp. 2d 212, 233
(E.D.N.Y. 2006) authorizing extra-record discovery where there
was evidence that the agency decision-makers had made a
decision and, only thereafter took steps "to find acceptable
rationales for the decision." Second, the Administrative
Record reveals that Secretary Ross overruled senior Census
Bureau career staff, who had concluded -- and this is at page

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1277 of the record -- that reinstating the citizenship question would be "very costly" and "harm the quality of the census count." Once again, see Tummino, 427 F.Supp. 2d at 231-32, holding that the plaintiffs had made a sufficient showing of bad faith where "senior level personnel overruled the professional staff." Third, plaintiffs' allegations suggest that defendants deviated significantly from standard operating procedures in adding the citizenship question. Specifically, plaintiffs allege that, before adopting changes to the questionnaire, the Census Bureau typically spends considerable resources and time -- in some instances up to ten years -testing the proposed changes. See the amended complaint which is docket no. 85 in the states' case at paragraph 59. Here, by defendants' own admission -- see the amended complaint at paragraph 62 and page 1313 of the Administrative Record -defendants added an entirely new question after substantially less consideration and without any testing at all. Yet again Tummino is instructive. See 427 F.Supp. 2d at 233, citing an "unusual" decision-making process as a basis for extra-record discovery.

Finally, plaintiffs have made at least a prima facie showing that Secretary Ross's stated justification for reinstating the citizenship question -- namely, that it is necessary to enforce Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act -- was pretextual. To my knowledge, the Department of Justice and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

civil rights groups have never, in 53 years of enforcing Section 2, suggested that citizenship data collected as part of the decennial census, data that is by definition quickly out of date, would be helpful let alone necessary to litigating such claims. See the states case docket no. 187-1 at 14; see also paragraph 97 of the amended complaint. On top of that, plaintiffs' allegations that the current Department of Justice has shown little interest in enforcing the Voting Rights Act casts further doubt on the stated rationale. See paragraph 184 of the complaint which is docket no. 1 in the Immigration Coalition case. Defendants may well be right that those allegations are "meaningless absent a comparison of the frequency with which past actions have been brought or data on the number of investigations currently being undertaken," and that plaintiffs may fail "to recognize the possibility that the DOJ's voting-rights investigations might be hindered by a lack of citizenship data." That is page 5 of the government's letter which is docket no. 194 in the states case. But those arguments merely point to and underscore the need to look beyond the Administrative Record.

To be clear, I am not today making a finding that

Secretary Ross's stated rationale was pretextual -- whether it

was or wasn't is a question that I may have to answer if or

when I reach the ultimate merits of the issues in these cases.

Instead, the question at this stage is merely whether --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

assuming the truth of the allegations in their complaints — plaintiffs have made a strong preliminary or prima facie showing that they will find material beyond the Administrative Record indicative of bad faith. See, for example, Ali v. Pompeo, 2018 WL 2058152 at page 4 (E.D.N.Y. May 2, 2018). For the reasons I've just summarized, I conclude that the plaintiffs have done so.

That brings me to the question of scope. On that score, I am mindful that discovery in an APA action, when permitted, "should not transform the litigation into one involving all the liberal discovery available under the federal rules. Rather, the Court must permit only that discovery necessary to effectuate the Court's judicial review; i.e., review the decision of the agency under Section 706." That is from Ali v. Pompeo at page 4, citing cases. I recognize, of course, that plaintiffs argue that they are independently entitled to discovery in connection with their constitutional I'm inclined to disagree given that the APA itself claims. provides for judicial review of agency action that is "contrary to" the Constitution. See, for example, Chang v. USCIS, 254 F.Supp. 3d 160 at 161-62 (D.D.C. 2017). But, even if plaintiffs are correct on that score, it is well within my authority under Rule 26 to limit the scope of discovery.

Mindful of those admonitions, not to mention the separation of powers principles at stake here, I am not

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

inclined to allows as much or as broad discovery as the plaintiffs seek, at least in the first instance. First, absent agreement of defendants or leave of Court, of me, I will limit plaintiffs to ten fact depositions. To the extent that plaintiffs seek to take more than that, they will have to make a detailed showing in the form of a letter motion, after conferring with defendants, that the additional deposition or depositions are necessary. Second, again absent agreement of the defendants or leave of Court, I will limit discovery to the Departments of Commerce and Justice. As defendants' own arguments make clear, materials from the Department of Justice are likely to shed light on the motivations for Secretary Ross's decision -- and were arguably constructively considered by him insofar as he has cited the December 2017 letter as the basis for his decision. At this stage, however, I am not persuaded that discovery from other third parties would be necessary or appropriate; to the extent that third parties may have influenced Secretary Ross's decision, one would assume that that influence would be evidenced in Commerce Department materials and witnesses themselves. Further, to the extent that plaintiffs would seek discovery from the White House, including from current and former White House officials, it would create "possible separation of powers issues." That is from page 4 of the slip opinion in the Nielsen order. although I suspect there will be a strong case for allowing a

deposition of Secretary Ross himself, I will defer that question to another day. For one thing, I think it should be the subject of briefing in and of itself. It raises a number of thorny issues. For another, I'm inclined to think that plaintiffs should take other depositions before deciding whether they need or want to go down that road and bite off that issue recognizing, among other things, that defendants have raised the specter of appellate review in the event that I did allow it. At the same time, I want to make sure that I have enough time to decide the issue and to allow for the possibility of appellate review without interfering with an expeditious schedule. So on that issue I'd like you to meet and confer with one another and discuss a timeline and a way of raising the issue, that is to say, when it is both ripe but also timely and would allow for an orderly resolution.

So with those limitations, I will allow plaintiffs to engage in discovery beyond the record. Further, I will allow for expert discovery. Expert testimony would seem to be commonplace in cases of this sort. See, for example, Cuomo v. Baldrige, 674 F.Supp. 1089 (S.D.N.Y. 1987). And as I indicated in my colloquy with Ms. Vargas, I do not read Sierra v. United States Army Corps of Engineers, 772 F.2d 1043 (2d Cir. 1985), to "prohibit" expert discovery as defendants suggestion. That case, in my view, speaks the deference that a court ultimately owes the agency's own expert analyses, but it does not speak to

the propriety of expert discovery, let alone clearly prohibit such discovery, let alone do so in a case where, as I have just done so, a finding of bad faith and a rebuttal of the presumption of regularity are at issue.

That leaves only the question of timing. I recognize that you proposed schedules without knowing the scope of discovery that I would permit. I would like to set a schedule today. In that regard, would briefly hear from both sides with respect to the schedule. Alternatively, I could allow you to meet and confer and propose a schedule in writing if you think that that would be more helpful. Let me facilitate the discussion by throwing out a proposed schedule which is based in part on your letters and modifications that I've made to the scope of discovery.

First, by July 16, I think defendants should produce the complete record as well as a privilege log and initial disclosures. I recognize that Rule 26(a)(1)(B)(i) exempts from initial disclosure "an action for review on an administrative record" but in light of my decision allowing extra-record discovery I do not read that exception to apply.

Then I would propose that by September 7, plaintiffs will disclose their expert reports.

By September 21, defendants will disclose their expert reports, if any.

By October 1, plaintiffs will disclose any rebuttal

expert reports.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And fact an expert discovery would close by October 12, 2018.

Plaintiffs also propose that the parties would then be ready for trial on October 31. My view is it's premature to talk about having a trial. For one thing, it may well end up making sense to proceed by way of summary judgment rather than trial. For another thing, I don't know if we need to build in time for Daubert motions or other pretrial motions that would require more than 19 days to brief and for me to decide. would be inclined, instead, to schedule a status conference for sometime in September to check in on where things stand, making sure that things are proceeding apace and get a sense of what is coming down the pike and decide how best to proceed. Having said that, I think it would make sense for you guys to block time in late October and November in the event that I do decide a trial is warranted. Again, I am mindful that my word is not likely to be the final one here and I want to make sure that all sides have an adequate opportunity to seek whatever review they would need to seek after a final decision.

So that's my ruling. You can respond to my proposed schedule. I'd be inclined to set it today but if you think you need additional time.

MR. FREEDMAN: Your Honor, John Freedman. Just one clarification. I think it was clear from what you said but in

terms of the number of depositions you meant ten collectively between the two cases, not ten per case?

THE COURT: Correct. And they would be cross-designated or cross-referenced in both cases. Correct.

MR. FREEDMAN: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: And, again, I don't mean to suggest that you will get more, but that's not — I did invite you to make a showing with specificity for why additional depositions would be needed. If it turns out that it is warranted, I'm prepared to allow it but, mindful of the various principles at stake and the limited scope of review under the APA, I think that it makes sense to rein discovery in in a way that it wouldn't be a standard civil action.

So, thoughts?

MR. COLANGELO: Your Honor, for the state and local government plaintiffs, we have no concerns at all.

THE COURT: Microphone, please.

MR. COLANGELO: For the state and local government plaintiffs, we have no concerns at all with the various deadlines that the Court has set out. Thank you.

MR. FREEDMAN: Your Honor, for the NYIC plaintiffs we concur. We think that it sets an appropriately expedited schedule that will resolve the issues in time and we appreciate the expedited consideration.

THE COURT: All right. Defendants.